

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-4,6-9, 11-18, 20, 21, 28 and 29 under U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Laor et al. The Examiner states that Laor discloses a micromirror array assembly comprising micromirrors, a plurality of permanent magnets and at least one permanent magnet coupled to each of the plurality of micromirrors in the array.

We cannot agree. Laor et al. does not show or suggest utilization of a micromirror array assembly. In the portion of Col. 5, at LL 9-20, referred to by the Examiner, it discusses the utilization of one or two moveable mirrors in this system. No array of mirrors is shown. More importantly, the system of Laor is utilized to reflect light generated by one optical device to another.

In sharp contrast, the present invention utilizes an array of mirrors as clearly shown in the present application FIGUREs 7-10. The utilization of the array of mirrors to steer the beam permits a relatively large beam in spot size which can be accurately steered with a relatively strong signal intensity without violating a regulatory or safety power density limits. This array is not only less expensive to manufacture than a similarly sized single mirror, but the range of the angle of deflection and thus steerability of the light beam is likely to be much larger with the micromirror array than the corresponding single mirror, as disclosed in Laor et al. Claims 1-5 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 6 and 9 have been combined in order to more clearly recite the utilization of the array to steer the beam as has claims 13 and 15. Claims 21 and 29 have been similarly amended.

The Examiner rejects Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laor et al. in view of Neukermans et al. The Examiner states that Laor does not disclose a metallic coating on the mirror but Neukermans discloses a metallic coating. Claim 5 has been cancelled without prejudice.

S/N 10/024,321

Page 10 of 11

The Examiner rejects claims 22-27 and 30-35 under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laor et al. As discussed above, Claim 21, from which Claim 22 depends, has been amended similar to that of Claim 9. Accordingly, Applicant's believe that this structure clearly distinguishes the present invention over Laor et al.

The Examiner rejects claims 10 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Laor et al. in view of Garverick et al. The Examiner states that Laor does not disclose that the control circuitry operates the coils in a time-multiplexed fashion. The Examiner states that Garverick disclosed a control system for a MEMs switch implementation that operates under a time-multiplexed fashion.

We can not agree. Claim 10 is now dependent upon amended Claim 6, which corresponds to the combination of claims 6 and 9. However, in view of the discussion above concerning Laor et al., Applicant's believe that Claim 10 is clearly distinguished from the combination of Claim 10 and Garverick et al. Similarly, Claim 19 is dependent upon Claim 13, which is the combination of claims 13 and 15 in which is also distinguished over this combination for the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants believe the Application, as amended, is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Texas Instruments Incorporated

By



William B. Kempler
Senior Corporate Patent Counsel
Reg. No. 28,228
(972) 917-5452